


~~Please Date Stamp and return~~

Communication to the Examiner; copy of the Office Action mailed February 20, 2003 with attachments

APPLICANT(S): Seishi SUEHIRA  
SERIAL NO: 09/447,052  
CONFIRMATION NO. 3304  
TITLE: HUB DOCUMENT PREPARATION METHOD  
FILING DATE: November 23, 1999  
DOCKET NO: 1075.1124/JTS:na  
DUE DATE:



RECEIVED

SEP 09 2003

Technology Center 2600

COPY

~~Please Date Stamp and return~~

Communication to the Examiner; copy of the Office Action mailed February 20, 2003 with attachments

APPLICANT(S): Seishi SUEHIRA  
SERIAL NO: 09/447,052  
CONFIRMATION NO. 3304  
TITLE: HUB DOCUMENT PREPARATION METHOD  
FILING DATE: November 23, 1999  
DOCKET NO: 1075.1124/JTS:na  
DUE DATE:



3



**LAW OFFICES  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP**

**COPY**

Telephone  
(202) 434-1500

700 Eleventh Street, N.W.  
Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20001

Facsimile  
(202) 434-1501

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

March 24, 2003

**RECEIVED**

SEP 09 2003  
Technology Center 2600

TO : U.S. PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

ATTN: Ella Washington  
Office of Filing Receipts/OIPE

FAX NO.: 703-746-7240

TELEPHONE:

FROM: James T. Strom

RE: Serial No. 09/447,052

OUR DOCKET: 1075.1124

NO. OF PAGES (Including this Cover Sheet) 8

**PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL**

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, and is intended only for the use of the addressee(s). Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited. If there are any problems with this transmission, please contact us immediately.

COMMENTS: The Office Action mailed on February 20, 2003 failed to include the Examiner's comments concerning the reasons for rejecting the claims in the above-referenced application. We only received the cover page, the Office Action Summary and the general attachments. We are respectfully requesting that a complete copy of the original Office Action be sent by facsimile as well as by first-class mail to James T. Strom, whose facsimile number is 202/434-1501.

We respectfully request that the period for responding to this Office Action be reset to correspond to the actual date that this Office Action is forwarded to Mr. Strom.



COPY

Docket No.: 1075.1124

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Seishi SUEHIRA

Serial No. 09/447,052

Group Art Unit: 2748

Confirmation No. 3304

Filed: November 23, 1999

Examiner: C.A. Bieneman

For: HUB DOCUMENT PREPARATION METHOD

COMMUNICATION TO THE EXAMINER

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED

SEP 09 2003

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

The Office Action mailed on February 20, 2003 failed to include the Examiner's comments concerning the reasons for rejecting the claims in the above-referenced application. We only received the cover page, the Office Action Summary and the general attachments (a copy of the entire correspondence is attached). We are respectfully requesting that a complete copy of the original Office Action be sent by facsimile as well as by first-class mail to James T. Strom, whose facsimile number is 202/434-1501.

We respectfully request that the period for responding to this Office Action be reset to correspond to the actual date that this Office Action is forwarded to Mr. Strom.

We also note that we made multiple requests from March 17-21 to re-due this problem. With some frustration, we were repeatedly redirected from one PTO office to the next, often being referred back to the originally contacted office.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 27, 2003

By: James T. Strom

James T. Strom  
Registration No. 48,702



700 11th Street, N.W., Ste. 500  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 434-1500




## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

[Home](#)[Index](#)[Search](#)[System Alerts](#)[eBusiness Center](#)[News & Notices](#)[Contact Us](#)

## PATENT APPLICATION INFORMATION RETRIEVAL



## Other Links




Search results for application number: 09/447,052			
Application Number:	09/447,052	Customer Number:	21171
Filing or 371(c) Date:	11-23-1999	Status:	Non Final Action Ma
Application Type:	Utility	Status Date:	05-08-2003
Examiner Name:	BIENEMAN, CHARLES A	Location:	2100 CENTRAL FILE OVERFLOW FRANC
Group Art Unit:	2176	Location Date:	08-15-2003
Confirmation Number:	3304	Earliest Publication No:	-
Attorney Docket Number:	1075.1124/JD	Earliest Publication Date:	-
Class/ Sub-Class:	707/513	Patent Number:	-
First Named Inventor:	SEISHI SUEHIRA, KAWASAKI-SHI, (JP)	Issue Date of Patent:	-
Title Of Invention: HUB DOCUMENT PREPARATION METHOD			

[Foreign Priority](#)[Continuity Data](#)[Publication Review](#)

File Contents History		
Number	Date	Contents Description
18	05-08-2003	Mail Notice of Restarted Response Period
17	05-08-2003	Letter Restarting Period for Response (i.e. Letter re: Reference
16	04-21-2003	Mail Notice of Restarted Response Period
15	04-09-2003	Letter Restarting Period for Response (i.e. Letter re: Reference
14	03-27-2003	Examiner Interview Summary Record (PTOL - 413)
11	03-27-2003	Miscellaneous Incoming Letter
10	02-20-2003	Mail Non-Final Rejection
9	02-10-2003	Non-Final Rejection
8	12-03-2002	Case Docketed to Examiner in GAU
7	10-20-2000	Case Docketed to Examiner in GAU
6	11-23-1999	Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) Filed
5	11-23-1999	Request for Foreign Priority (Priority Papers May Be Included)
4	03-13-2000	Case Docketed to Examiner in GAU
3	12-28-1999	Application Dispatched from OIPE
2	12-16-1999	IFW Scan & PACR Auto Security Review
1	12-01-1999	Initial Exam Team nn

[HOME](#) | [INDEX](#) | [SEARCH](#) | [SYSTEM ALERTS](#) | [eBUSINESS CENTER](#) |

[NEWS&NOTICES](#) | [CONTACT US](#) | [PRIVACY STATEMENT](#)



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/447,052	02/23/1999	SEISHI SUEHIRA	1075.1124/JD	3304

21171 7590 02/20/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
700 11TH STREET, NW  
SUITE 500  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER
----------

BIENEMAN, CHARLES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.


RECEIVED

SEP 09 2003

Technology Center 2600

COPY

faxed March 31, 2003



Office Action Summary

09/447,052

SUEHIRA, SEISHI

Examiner

Art Unit

Charles A. Bieneman

2176

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.138(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may not earn patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

RECEIVED

SEP 09 2003

Technology Center 2600

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 November 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other.

Art Unit: 2176

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: original application, priority document, and Information Disclosure Statement, all filed on November 23, 1999.

2. Claims 1-48 are pending. Claims 1 and 48 are independent claims.

COPY

#### *Priority*

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

#### *Specification*

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

#### *Claim Objections*

5. Claims 4-12 are objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "file names same as" is not grammatical. Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 1 recites converting non-structured documents into structured documents in lines 19-21. The specification discloses at various points that a CPU carries out this conversion



Art Unit: 2176

(e.g., page 19, lines 15-17; page 24, lines 25-27), but does not disclose the method or means by which the conversion is actually done. Therefore, the disclosure would not have enabled one skilled in the art to practiced the claimed invention.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

COPY

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 1-48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,377,956 B1 to Hsu et al., issued April 23, 2002, filed February 22, 1999 in view World Wide Web Consortium, *XML Schema Part I: Structures*, W3C Working Draft (May 6, 1999). With respect to the rejection of each dependent claim below, the preceding rejection(s) of the relevant base claim(s) is incorporated therein.

Regarding **independent claim 1**, Hsu et al. teach setting in advance an original document storage area for storing the non-structured documents inasmuch as they teach specifying database tables or external files for the storage of component documents. (Hsu et al., col. 7, lines 26-32.) Hsu et al. also teach setting in advance a structured document storage area for storing structured documents obtained by conversion of the non-structured documents. (Hsu et al., col. 8, lines 16-18: "In the media preparation process, all source documents are processed and converted into standard formats, in particular, SGML, and are stored in the document database.")

Further, Hsu et al. do not explicitly teach but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store the non-structured document into the original storage area each

time it was prepared or edited because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that it would be desirable to have the most updated version of the non-structured document available for conversion to a structured document. (Hsu et al., col. 8, lines 16-18, quoted above.)

Further, Hsu et al. teach converting non-structured documents into structured documents and storing them in the structured document storage area. (Hsu et al., col. 8, lines 16-18.)

Further, Hsu et al. do not teach acquiring document names of the structured documents and preparing entity declarations for referring to entities of the structured documents. However, *XML Schema Part I* teaches in section 3.6.2 on page 38 external parsed entities, "a feature of XML that offers a method for including well-formed XML document fragments, including text and markup, by direct reference to the storage object of the parsed entity." Further, in the example at the top of page 39, *XML Schema Part I* depicts entity declarations containing the names of structured documents. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that these entity declarations provide a straightforward and efficient way to refer to component documents, and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend Hsu et al. to acquire document names of the structured documents and prepare entity declarations for referring to entities of the structured documents.

Further, Hsu et al. do not teach preparing the hub document based on the entity declarations regarding the structured documents. However, *XML Schema Part I* in the example in section 3.6.2 on page 39 depicts a hub document based on the entity declarations regarding the structured documents. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that basing a hub document on the entity declarations would have provided the benefit of flexible and efficient document production, allowing reuse of components in different documents and

COPY

ensuring that the most up-to-date versions of components were used. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have prepared the hub document based on the entity declarations regarding the structured documents.

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, Hsu et al. teach an attachment file storage area set in advance, and storing attachment files into the storage area, inasmuch as they teach the original file storage area as discussed above regarding claim 1 and further state that “[m]edia files, which are also document objects, are also managed in the same way as component documents.” (Hsu et al., col. 7, lines 25-26.) Further, Hsu et al. do not teach preparing entity declarations for the attachment file or preparing the hub document based on the entity declarations for the attachment files as well as the entity declarations for the structured documents, but these elements would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of *XML Schema Part I* under the same rationale stated above regarding claim 1 for the obviousness of creating entity declarations and preparing the hub document based on the entity declarations regarding the structured documents.

Regarding **dependent claim 3**, the rejection of claim 2 above is fully incorporated herein. Further, Hsu et al. do not teach setting in advance an entity declaration storage area. However, in view of the obviousness of using entity declarations, discussed above regarding claim 1, it further would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have set in advance an entity storage area because one of ordinary skill would have recognized the benefit of having a central storage area from which entity declarations could be accessed and used for multiple documents.

COPY

Regarding **dependent claims 4-6**, Hsu et al. do not teach the entity declarations of the structured documents having the same file names as the file names of the original unstructured document. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that giving entity declarations the same names as the original unstructured document would have had the benefit of making clear to what original document the entity declaration referred, and therefore the step recited in these claims would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding **dependent claims 7-12**, Hsu et al. do not teach the entity declarations for the attachment files having the same file names as the file names of the non-structured documents to which the attachment files are attached. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that giving attachment entity declarations the same names as the original unstructured document would have had the benefit of making clear to what original document the attachment was attached, and therefore the step recited in these claims would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding **dependent claims 13-24**, Hsu et al. teach the attachment files being graphic files including graphic information. (Hsu et al., col. 7, lines 61-65: "For each component document, the author also prepares for all needed multimedia files for diagrams, images, drawings, etc. in some standard formats such as CGM, TIFF, GIF, etc., which may be incorporated in the SGML files.")

Regarding **dependent claims 24-48**, Hsu et al. teach that the structured documents a Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML) documents whose structure is defined by a Document Type Definition (DTD). (Hsu et al., col. 7, lines 33-37: "Component documents are preferably represented in SGML (See SGML: Standard Generalized Markup Language, ISO/IEC

Application/Control Number: 07/447,052

Art Unit: 2176

COPY

8879:1986). SGML is a meta-language for defining document structures, referred to as Document Type Definition (DTD). An SGML document structure is an instance of its associated DTD.")

### Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent Number	Name	Issue Date	File Date
6,507,858 B1	Kanerva et al.	1/14/03	2/25/98
6,490,603 B1	Keenan et al.	12/3/02	3/19/99
6,202,072 B1	Kuwahara	3/13/01	12/5/97
6,101,511	DeRose et al.	8/8/00	7/19/91
6,014,680	Sato et al.	1/11/00	8/29/96
5,655,130	Dodge et al.	8/5/97	10/14/94

11. World Wide Web Consortium, *Document Definition Markup Language (DDML) Specification, Version 1.0*, W3C Note (January 19, 1999). See especially section 2.6.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles A. Bieneman whose telephone number is 703-305-8045. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:00 a.m. - 5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2176


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

CAB  
January 27, 2003

COPY

HEATHER R. ...  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

JTS



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Response Due: 5-20-03

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/447,052	11/23/1999	SEISHI SUEHIRA	1075.1124/JD	3304

21171 7590 04/21/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
700 11TH STREET, NW  
SUITE 500  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

BIENEMAN, CHARLES A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER


2176  
DATE MAILED: 04/21/2003

RECEIVED

SEP 09 2003


Technology Center 2600

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



COPY

APR 24 2003



## Interview Summary

Application N .

09/447,052

Applicant(s)

SUEHIRA, SEISHI

Examiner

Charles A. Bieneman

Art Unit

2176

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Charles A. Bieneman.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

RECEIVED

SEP 09 2003

Technology Center 2600

Date of Interview: filing 3/27/03.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: n/a.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Office action needs to be re-sent and time for reply needs to be re-set as requested by applicant in letter filed 3/27/03 (paper #6). A copy of a 326, an 892, and the Office action is in the file to send (the other copy of these documents is already in the file).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

COPY

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required